

**REMARKS**

Claims 13 and 14 were pending in the above-identified application. Claim 14 was under consideration. Claim 13 was withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The Examiner stated that if claim 13 were to be amended back to the compound claim, claim 13 would be rejected for various reasons. Applicants have cancelled claim 13 as a matter of expediency in order to place the pending claims in order for allowance. Accordingly, these issues regarding claim 13 is moot.

Regarding claim 14, Applicants have amended dependent claim 14 to be in independent form in order to place claim 14 in order for allowance. No new matter has been added.

At page 1 of the Office Action dated November 19, 2004 (i.e., Office Action Summary) the Examiner appears to reject claim 14. However, the rejection appears as a carry over an inadvertent typographical error. The patentability of claim 14 was addressed in the prior amendment (i.e., Response To April 14, 2004 Office Action dated August 9, 2004). The Examiner has not addressed that explanation.

Regarding the provisional rejection of claim 14, Applicants enclose herein a terminal disclaimer in order to obviate any nonstatutory type double patenting rejection of the above mentioned claim 14.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claim 14 is allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Note to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 21, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000